CDC Information Council
Meeting Minutes
May 30, 2002, 3:00p.m.-5:00p.m.
Roybal Campus, Bldg. 16, Room 5126

CDC Information Council met on May 30, 2002, Roybal Campus, Building 16, Room
5126, at 3:00p.m. Janet Collins and John Loonsk co-chaired the meeting.

Updates:

- **Hotsite Funding (Janet Collins and John Loonsk)**
John Loonsk discussed the plans for the implementation of Hotsite funding as they
were outlined in a document distributed by Jim Seligman. These plans include
developing continuity of operations, establishment of a hotsite for critical operations,
and work on issues relative to secure data system implementation. He asked the CIC
to send forth comments on outstanding issues.

- **BT Functions and Specifications as External Enterprise Standards Work
  Group (John Loonsk)**
The CIC BT Functions and Specifications as External Standards group met on May
22, 2002. The group members are Bob Pinner, Denise Koo, Tonya Martin,
Gianfranco Pezzino, and John Loonsk. John indicated that the group was not
successful in coming to closure on what would need to be done to have the functions
and standards as external standards. The group will continue to do work to come up
with an agreement. Bob Pinner indicated that the group successfully identified a set
of next steps.

Debbie Jones asked if there were areas of disagreement concerning what is in the
standards. John Loonsk responded that the group will be working to address the
questions and issues from the CIOs and to clarify scope.

Denise Koo added that there is not an issue with content but adding the rationale for
the content is important. The scope issue needs to be clear about where the
information came from and the plan for how to move forward.

Agenda Item #1: Web Redesign Advisory Group Update (Marc Overcash)
Marc presented an overview of the Website Redesign project. He also provided
background material to help with an understanding of the various phases of the
project. He described the three major threads of the project and gave an update of the
current ongoing activities. The "Creative" thread involves the visual look and feel.
This includes font, colors, layouts and mood boards. Marc invited all CIO's to attend
the next mood board session on May 29, 2002. The "Information Architecture"
thread involves how the information is presented, structured and organized. The
following activities are underway in the information architecture process:

1. Identifying the content types
2. Looking at attributes associated with content types
3. Putting content types and metadata together

The "Web Publishing and Portal Infrastructure" thread includes vendor selection. The selectors are looking at search engine, content document management, portal server, reporting and analysis, analysis of web content usage, collaboration tools and knowledge management.

The next steps in the vendor selection process are:
1. Send draft recommendations to Advisory group and vendor selection participants (May 30)
2. 5-day comment period
3. Presentation to CTOC (June 6)
4. Presentation of recommendations with vendor selection participants (June 7)
5. Incorporation of comments and another iteration of recommendations sent to Advisory group (June 10)
6. Advisory group review

Other upcoming points of interest and deliverables available for presentation include:
- Creative page designs
- Taxonomy, Wireframes, Site map, Content types/Metadata
- Use cases that model how users interact with the system
- Functional prototype

Comments:
Nabil Issa asked if there was a need for data publishing and if there is a need for data sets. John Loonsk answered, "It is not the principal thrust of this activity". He commented that this can facilitate data publishing but is not meant for data downloading.

Debbie Jones asked if for current content and future content which needs to be put up quickly, it is possible to do so without all vocabulary defined.

Bob Pinner indicated that there will be policy issues, which will come up around the use of these products and they will be brought to CIC.

Denise Koo recommended that the Controlled Medical Terminology be presented to the Excellence in Science Committee. She will discuss it with Dixie Snider.

Nabil Issa asked, "Has there been an assessment of the impact of migration?"

John Loonsk indicated that there would be quantification under the existing contract. He said that a lot could be done in an automated manner. Nabil emphasized the need to

consider the quality control on what is put out on the Internet. John Loonsk indicated that this is not in the scope of this project.

Debbie Jones asked, " After the vendor recommendations are made, will you be looking for a single supplier of all six?" Marc Overcash answered, "We are looking for one vendor for each".

Agenda Item #3: CIC Agenda Items and Working Group Update (Janet Collins)
Janet Collins described the agenda items list as a composition of issues, which have come from various sources. She asked the CIC to provide comments and guidance for framing the issues.

John Loonsk asked for a volunteer for co-chair to the CDC Software Development and the Funding of IT and Extramural Initiatives group.

Jaspal Sagoo asked that time sensitive items (because of procurement deadlines) be given higher priority such as the Desktop Videoconferencing final report. Time sensitivity should be

Marty Baum mentioned that the "Knowledge Management Sharing One Day Seminar" is also sensitive since the target date of the seminar is late September.

Andy Autry asked about the status of the evaluation of IHSIS. Janet Collins responded, " Gartner group is assisting in this evaluation and it is on schedule at this time."

John Loonsk indicated that he we might benefit from the IHSIS report recommendations so he thought the NEDSS subject areas should be postponed until that time.

Claire Broome indicated that CSTE sent a letter asking for refinement of definitions of NEDSS compatibility, compliance and interoperability.

Gianfranco Pezzino commented that under the heading of NEDSS standards, it would be helpful to have the discussion about the definitions.

Claire Broome said that she would also like to see what comes out of the Gartner report.

Janet Collins commented that the evaluation is on schedule. She also commented that high priority would be given to IHSIS once the report was ready.

John Loonsk commented that he would like to see a process review for Capital Investment Planning.

John Teeter suggested that the following three bullets be given priority. GAO will be visiting again soon and it was reported that this would be done at the last GAO audit.

- Process for CDC-wide IT standards-identification and management

- Process for review of CDC IT systems and projects
- Architecture process including Capital Investment planning

John Loonsk suggested that it might be necessary to reconstitute the PREP group to meet the timing needs of these issues. Although, the CIC is the responsible group for this activity. He indicated that there is a need for a picture to be developed to show how it all fits together. The picture should show how the projects integrate with existing staff, infrastructure, budgets, etc.

Janet Collins questioned the group as to whether or not; this should be a presentation at the next meeting.

John Loonsk felt that the discussion is best as a discussion of a proposal. He feels that either a working group or John Teeter's group should start to flush out in a proposal that includes the statutory requirements.

Janet Collins asked the CIC if there were other issues for the table.

Denise Koo commented that the CDC-wide data standards would be helpful to have as a high priority.

Janet Collins suggested a more formalized group with a CTOC member for IT Functions and Specifications.

Joseph Reid said that there is draft security document that was produced as part of the HISSB that is waiting for some action. Joseph will send document to Laura Conn for consideration as a CIC agenda item.

Laura Conn asked the group to send agenda items to the Executive Secretariat as they have them.

Agenda Item #4: CDC Preparedness and Response IT Projects and Technical Assistance Needs (John Loonsk)
John Loonsk distributed several documents, which describe CDC Preparedness and Response IT projects and BT Guidance Direct Assistance. He asked for comments from CIC members.

Comments:
Bob Pinner asked, "Is this an update or draft for comments?"
John Loonsk responded, "This is a draft for comment on aspects of execution and process."

Denise Koo asked if John would be asking for names for the Project Advisory group. John Loonsk said he would be asking for volunteers when the groups are ready to be formed.

John Loonsk commented that the concept of most of the projects would be pursued through a contract-oriented project. On the non-contract side (CDC) there are three roles, the project advisory group, the project manager, and the program coordinator.

Lew Newlin asked, "Who selects the contractor?" John Loonsk said that there will be a request for proposals and it would be a GSA selection process and would involve input from the Advisory group, the project manager and program coordinator. Lew also asked, "Will the project manager and program coordinator work on only BT preparedness projects?" John Loonsk indicated that the intent is to have Center input. He said that many are BT specific.

Marty Baum commented that a lot of the projects listed are BT specific but that they have applicability to other areas as well. He used the example of call response. He suggested that many areas could benefit from these projects. John Loonsk agreed that these would have applicability outside of bioterrorism. However, these projects are on short time lines for achieving solutions to the problems. Marty suggested folding in other areas whenever possible to avoid duplication.

Nabil Issa felt that it would be difficult to get all of the CIO's to agree but that regardless of the decision, it will have impact and therefore it is necessary to address how these projects are going to integrate within the existing structures in CIO's. John Loonsk commented that some of these projects would not affect every CIO and therefore should not be lumped in the same bin with NEDSS.

Claire Broome added that part of the responsibility of the CIC is to figure out how to make these projects work.

Bob Pinner asked if these were six concurrent projects and John Loonsk answered," Yes".

John Loonsk discussed the BT activity, which involves preparedness with partners. He would like to ensure that the data is shared and robust. He also indicated that a state could use bioterrorism funds to engage this process because it supports their activities. John asked for ideas for a list of potential discussion areas and he would like for the partners to give input.

Denise Koo asked if there is a deadline to send comments. John asked for submission of questions and comments to Laura Conn or Barbara Nichols by COB June 14, 2002.

Attendees:
Members/Alternates

Andrew Autry (NCBDDD)
Claire Broome (OD)
Terry Boyd (NIP)
Janet Collins (NCCDPHP)
Nabil Issa (NCEH)
Debbie Jones (PHPPO)
Ed Kilbourne (ATSDR) - phone
Denise Koo (EPO)
John Loonsk (IRMO)
Tonya Martin (NCHSTP)
Bob Pinner (NCID)

Partners:
Seth Foldy (NACCHO)-phone
Gianfranco Pezzino (CSTE)-envision

Others:
Marty Baum (NCEH)
Laura Conn (IRMO)
Mike Donnelly(OD)
Lew Newlin (DHPPO)
Barbara Nichols (IRMO)
Marc Overcash (IRMO)
Joseph Reid (IRMO)
Jaspal Sagoo (NCHSTP)
Catherine Spruill (OADS)
John Teeter (IRMO)